

## Guide for Evaluators – Assessment of Project Ideas IdeaLab ‘Cities for the future: services and solutions’

### 1. The IdeaLab workshop

#### What is the IdeaLab workshop?

The IdeaLab is a residential interactive workshop over five days organised in a location isolated from everyday distractions – so that the participants could focus on the challenges of the workshop. The IdeaLab workshop is an intensive discussion forum where free thinking is encouraged to delve into the problems on the agenda to uncover innovative solutions. Outcomes are not pre-determined but are defined during the event. The workshop is led by the chair of the Panel of Experts (workshop director), who is supported by members of the Panel of Experts (mentors), facilitators and, if necessary, a group of stakeholders to encourage the workshop participants to think outside the box about the challenges of the workshop.

The group, stripped of pre-conceptions, will explore and deconstruct the issue before refocusing on emerging solutions. The workshop activities are designed to take the participants out of the comfort zones enabling them to develop radical research ideas and solutions to a specific societal challenge. The presence of participants representing different expertise, backgrounds, research areas, interest groups or sectors, as well as the director, mentors and stakeholders, enables the development of new insights, perspectives and understandings.

For more information on the IdeaLab workshop (topic, research challenges, etc.), please see ‘**The IdeaLab Workshop Guideline**’.

#### Who is involved in the Idealab workshop?

**Participants** can be proposed by legal entities from Poland and from Norway, Iceland or Liechtenstein. The participants will be selected by the Workshop Director and mentors based on information provided on the Participant’s application form and participant’s CV. Participants come from a range of disciplines and backgrounds, including urban planning & governance, ecology, ICT, social science, humanities, technologies and other fields. Creativity, communication skills, and willingness to work in teams (and with individuals whom Participants may not know), willingness to step outside their area of expertise are the requisite personal attributes of IdeaLab Participants. It is the Participants who are responsible for the development of project ideas and partnerships.

**The mentors and the director** are international experts responsible for developing the topic during the IdeaLab workshop. They facilitate discussions, challenge the Participants, and evaluate the project ideas. The director and mentors bring a depth of rich knowledge about the topic to coach and challenge Participants in an open-minded way, and help great ideas to flourish.

**The facilitators** are responsible for the processes in the IdeaLab workshop. They design the activities, guide the mentors and the director, and run the IdeaLab. The facilitators provide everyone else with the appropriate processes to achieve the goals of the IdeaLab. Facilitators are external consultants with experience in organising sandpits/IdeaLabs. They will be contracted by the NCBR.

**The stakeholders** are people with real experience in the issues who provide invaluable insights and unique perspectives. Stakeholders can include NGO representatives, representatives of city

authorities and local self-governments, Government officials or citizens' groups. Their input and knowledge help Participants to explore the issues and shape potential ideas.

**The National Centre for Research and Development's staff** is responsible for administration and organisation of the workshop.

Representatives of the Research Council of Norway and other institutions involved in the Programme 'Applied Research' will participate in the IdeaLab workshop as observers.

### What are the stages at the IdeaLab workshop?

During the first stage, participants get to know each other, develop trust and learn from each other. They also connect to the topic, get insight into the expertise of other participants and agree on a common language and terminology. As the workshop progresses, the understanding of the challenges and topic deepens. Using creative and innovative thinking techniques helps in focusing on the problem. New possibilities are created, ideas are being explored and thinking about the topic is broadened. Project ideas are developed and project teams are created. One participant may be involved in many project ideas, as his/her qualifications or experience might be needed in many projects. The project teams may also change with the development of the project ideas. Eventually, the participants will have to make decisions about prioritisation of project ideas and partnerships they are involved in.

Once the project ideas become mature and the partnerships established, they are evaluated and further elaborated. Finally, the project ideas are written down using a project idea form and submitted. The submission deadline is on Thursday, 5 March 2020, at 21.00 CET. Please read the project idea form (Annex 1) to acquaint yourself with the information the research teams will be providing during the workshop.

On Friday, 6 March 2020, the project ideas will be presented by each research team led by the Principal Investigator. You will be asked to evaluate the project ideas – first individually, and then to reach consensus with other members of the Panel of Experts.

## 2. Panel of Experts meeting during the last day of the IdeaLab workshop (assessment of project ideas)

### Who is involved in the Panel of Experts?

The Panel of Experts will consist of **mentors and the director, who take part in the IdeaLab workshop**. In order to ensure impartiality of the assessment, mentors and the director step aside during the final phase of developing project ideas and preparing project pre-proposals. Furthermore, **two additional external experts are invited** exclusively for the meeting of the Panel of Experts, when the project ideas are assessed (the last day of the IdeaLab workshop). The additional experts do not take part in the IdeaLab workshop, as such their role is to ensure independent assessment of the project ideas developed during the workshop.

The experts' role in the Panel of Experts is to assess project ideas, agree for the ranking list of projects ideas recommended for funding and not recommended for funding, provide

recommendations for project teams and give feedback to the workshop participants regarding their project ideas.

**The National Centre for Research and Development's staff** participate in the Panel of Expert as observers, and deal with organisational and administrative issues during the meeting. They also give information about the budget for funding projects following the ranking list of projects ideas prepared by the panel members.

Representatives of the Research Council of Norway and other institutions involved in the Programme 'Applied Research' may participate in the Panel of Experts as observers.

### What is the project idea evaluation procedure?

The process for evaluation of project ideas will be as follows:

- The members of the Panel of Experts will perform an individual evaluation of each project idea based on project idea form and presentation of the project idea by the project team for the Panel of Experts.
- The members of the Panel of Experts will meet to discuss individual evaluations and agree on consensus scores and justification.

### What are the evaluation criteria for the project ideas developed during the IdeaLab?

You are invited to review the quality of the submitted project ideas based on four evaluation criteria. Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the four criteria according to the scoring scale below.

Criterion no. 1 'Relevance in relation to the objective and priorities of the research programme' is evaluated by stating YES or NO. The content of a project idea must be relevant to the topic of the IdeaLab workshop. If a project idea is found not relevant, during the consensus stage of the assessment, the proposal is rejected.

The remaining criteria, criteria from 2 to 4, will be scored from 0 to 5. Half point scores may be given. Weights to be applied to these criteria are presented in the table below.

Criteria	Score	Weight
<b>Criterion 1 – Relevance in relation to the objective and priorities of the research programme:</b> Coherence with the workshop topic	YES or NO	n/a
<b>Criterion 2 – Scientific and/or technical excellence</b> Subcriteria to be taken into account during evaluation: 2.1 Wow factor – Boldness in scientific and innovative thinking 2.2 Holistic perspective. Inter- and transdisciplinarity 2.3 Feasibility of the proposed project	0-5	60%
<b>Criterion 3 – The potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of the project results</b> Subcriteria to be taken into account during evaluation:	0-5	20%

<p>3.1. Socially desirable and environmentally sustainable idea</p> <p>3.2. Empowerment of stakeholders in the cities of the future</p> <p>3.3. Measurable goals: how do we know that the project has reached its goals?</p>		
<p><b>Criterion 4 – Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management, including quality and implementation capacity of the partnership and contribution to capacity and competence building</b></p> <p>Subcriteria to be taken into account during evaluation:</p> <p>4.1 Team and team dynamics</p> <p>4.2 Expertise and experience relevant for the project</p> <p>4.3 Project organisation, assets and appropriateness of costs with regards to the scope of the research</p>	0-5	20%

Score values for Criteria 2 to 4 indicate the following assessments:

- 0 – The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 – Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2 – Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.
- 3 – Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.
- 4 – Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
- 5 – Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

The subcriteria are assessed using the following scale:

- A: very good
- B: good
- C: fair / poor

The purpose of these auxiliary, indicative scores is only to help during the Panel of Experts meeting. The assessment of the subcriteria is not visible in the final scores.

#### **Individual rating of each project idea**

- 1) You will be given access to project ideas submitted within the deadline.
- 2) You will also be given and will read the guide for evaluators – this document.

- 3) You will be given a spreadsheet which will detail the project ideas in terms of the project title and name of the Principal Investigator. The applications will be ordered alphabetically by surname of the Principal Investigator. You will populate the spreadsheet during the presentations of each project idea with your scores and comments. You will be also given approximately 10 minutes after each presentation to further elaborate your comments.
- 4) Please, do not assess the project idea with which you have conflict of interest. You will be also asked by the chair of the panel to leave the room during the presentation of the project idea for which the conflict of interest is disclosed.
- 5) The content of the project idea must be relevant to the topic of the IdeaLab workshop (Criterion 1). Please write 'YES' if the project idea is relevant in relation to the objective and priorities of the IdeaLab workshop under the Programme 'Applied Research'. If the proposal fails to address the relevance criterion, please write 'NO' and provide a justification.
- 6) Provide your score from 0-5 for evaluation criteria from 2 to 4 and short comments. Please make sure you use the entire range of scores detailed above. The individual scoring and your comments provided in the justification will be further discussed during the Panel of Experts meeting.
- 7) There are three subcriteria provided under criterion 2 to 4. Please, take the subcriteria into consideration. They have been included to draw your attention to important aspects that should be analysed by experts. Please score the subcriteria during the presentations using the following scale:
  - A: very good
  - B: good
  - C: fair / poor

The purpose of these auxiliary, indicative scores is only to help during the Panel of Experts meeting.
- 8) **Complete your scores on the spreadsheet and rename it with your name in the title e.g. 'individual evaluation NAME.xls' and send it to [idealab@ncbr.gov.pl](mailto:idealab@ncbr.gov.pl) or handle it to staff of The National Centre for Research and Development.** This will enable them to populate the consensus report spreadsheet with all scores before the Panel of Experts meeting starts.

An instruction on how to fill in the spreadsheet for individual evaluation of the project ideas:

<b>Title of the project idea:</b>	...
<b>Name of the Principal Investigator:</b>	....
Criteria and subcriteria	<b>Individual expert assessment</b>
<b>Criterion 1 – Relevance in relation to the objective and priorities of the research programme:</b> Coherence with the workshop topic	<i>Please state YES or NO</i>
Comments:	<i>Please write a short comment here or justification if you stated 'NO' in Criterion 1</i>
<b>Criterion 2 – Scientific and/or technical excellence</b>	<i>Please score from 0 to 5</i>
2.1 Wow factor – Boldness in scientific and innovative thinking	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>

2.2 Holistic perspective. Inter- and transdisciplinarity	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
2.3 Feasibility of the proposed project	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
Comments:	<i>Please write a short comment here</i>
<b>Criterion 3 – The potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of the project results</b>	<i>Please score from 0 to 5</i>
3.1. Socially desirable and environmentally sustainable idea	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
3.2. Empowerment of stakeholders in the cities of the future	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
3.3. Measurable goals: how do we know that the project has reached its goals?	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
Comments:	<i>Please write a short comment here</i>
<b>Criterion 4 – Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management, including quality and implementation capacity of the partnership and contribution to capacity and competence building</b>	<i>Please score from 0 to 5</i>
4.1 Team and team dynamics	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
4.2 Expertise and experience relevant for the project	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
4.3 Project organisation, assets and appropriateness of costs with regards to the scope of the research	<i>Please score A, B or C</i>
<b>Comments:</b>	<i>Please write a short comment here</i>
<b>Recommendation for the project:</b>	<i>Please write a short comment here</i>

## Panel of Experts meeting

The Panel of Experts will assess each project idea in the following way:

- 1) The Panel of Experts will reach a consensus concerning this criterion relevance (criterion 1) based on the individual assessments. If a project idea is found not relevant, the proposal is rejected and the Panel of Experts must provide a justification. The decision of the Panel is recorded onto the spreadsheet by the chair of the Panel of Experts who is the rapporteur during the Panel meeting.
- 2) The Panel of Experts will reach a consensus concerning the score for each criterion from 2 to 4 based on the individual assessments. The Consensus Score is recorded onto the spreadsheet by the chair of the Panel of Experts. **Justification for each of the evaluation criteria is provided, and strengths and weaknesses of the project idea are described.** The Panel of Experts **may include recommendations** which have to be taken into account at the full proposal stage. The recommendations of the Panel of Experts are recorded onto the spreadsheet. The recommendations may include **adding an additional partner** to the project consortium at the full proposal stage if an experience in the particular field is missing within the project consortium. The budget of a potential additional partner should be included in the requested funding, and the total project cost stipulated in the project idea form. If the project team requests to add additional project partner, but the Panel of Experts gives the negative recommendation for such a change, the requested funding and total project costs are cut accordingly to the share of the additional partner in the budget.

- 3) The experts having a conflict of interest with the project idea will be asked by the chair of the Panel of Experts to leave the room during the discussion on the project idea.
- 4) The final score for each criterion is calculated using the weighting in the following way:  
Criterion 2 – Scientific and/or technical excellence – consensus score \* 60%  
Criterion 3 – The potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of the project results – consensus score \* 20%  
Criterion 4 – Quality and efficiency of implementation and management, including quality and implementation capacity of the partnership, and contribution to capacity and competence building – consensus score \* 20%
- 5) The final score for each project idea is calculated as a sum of the final scores for each criterion. All final scores will be given to two decimal places.
- 6) The final scores for all projects ideas are discussed by the Panel of Experts. When the Panel agrees on the assessment, the ranking list of project ideas is prepared. The Panel of Experts decides which project ideas are recommended for funding. The pre-proposals recommended for funding are ranked in order.
- 7) The consensus report spreadsheets for all projects ideas are printed and signed by all Panel of Experts members.
- 8) The National Centre for Research and Development's staff following the ranking list of recommended project ideas and information about requested funding and the budget for funding projects prepares calculation, which project ideas can be funded and which projects are on the reserve list.

### **Presentation of the evaluation results to the workshop participants**

The chair of the Panel of Experts will present the scores and inform the teams about the main strengths and weaknesses of their ideas. He/she will also inform the project teams about additional recommendations for the full proposal stage (if applicable).

The National Centre for Research and Development's staff will inform the project teams about the possibility of funding the project idea.

In case when the budget for funding projects is exhausted and there are pre-proposals recommended for funding that cannot be funded (the reserve list), the Principal Investigator receives from the Programme Operator information about the funding situation of the pre-proposal. The Principal Investigator, together with the project consortium, can decide to submit the full proposal. If one (or more) of the proposals that can be funded will not succeed in submitting the full proposal, the funding will go to the project from the reserve list that submitted the full proposal.

All partnerships established during the IdeaLab workshop which submitted and presented the project idea for evaluation by the Panel of Experts and received the recommendation for funding during the Panel of Experts are eligible to submit a full project proposal. The project idea developed during the workshop is an attachment to the full proposal. The project idea cannot be changed.

### **Next steps: assessment of the full proposals**

After submission of full proposals, you will be asked to provide an evaluation of the project with regards to the consistency of the project with the project idea developed during the IdeaLab

workshop. You will be given detailed instruction on how to assess the full proposal. Please note that full proposals will be ordered according to the ranking of project ideas prepared by the Panel of Experts during the IdeaLab workshop.



## Annex 1 Project idea form

IdeaLab ‘Cities for the future: services and solutions’ – project idea form	
Project title:	
Name and surname of the Principal Investigator:	
Total project cost:	EUR
Requested funding <sup>1</sup> of the entire project:	EUR
Requested funding of Project Promoter:.... [name of the entity]:	EUR
Requested funding of Project Partner 1: .... [name of the entity]:	EUR
Requested funding of Project Partner 2: .... [name of the entity]:	EUR
Requested funding of Project Partner ...: .... [name of the entity]:	EUR
Describe briefly (one or two sentences) what the project is all about, the objective of the project:	
<p><b>WHAT?</b></p> <p>Where is the novelty/adventure in this project? Why should this project be funded – what is the ‘wow’ factor? How is the project related to other projects and ongoing research in this area? How is the project inter- or transdisciplinary? What are the risks and how will you deal with them?</p>	
<p><b>WHY?</b></p> <p>What are the challenges addressed? How will the challenges be addressed? What do you propose to achieve (objectives)?</p>	

<sup>1</sup> The minimum grant amount is EUR 500,000. Please, note that requested funding of the entire project cannot be changed in the full proposal stage.

**HOW?**

Who is in the team? How is each team member contributing? How do you propose to achieve the objectives (methodology)? Duration, requested funding, other resources or support needed. Request for adding an additional project partner and its budget in the project.